UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FORT MYERS DIVISION

JENNIFER NORRIS, Individually, and as Parent and Legal Guardian of DYLAN NORRIS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

V.	Case No. 2:03-CV-563-FTM-29SPC
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
Defendant.	

Case Management Report

The parties have agreed on the following dates and discovery plan pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(f) and Local Rule 3.05(c):

DEADLINE OR EVENT		AGREED DATE
Certificate of Interested F Disclosure Statement	Persons and Corporate	Filed.
Motions to Add Parties or to Amend Pleadings		3/19/04
Disclosure of Expert Reports	Plaintiff:	7/16/04
	Defendant:	10/15/04
Discovery Deadline	Fact:	1/19/05
	Expert:	3/18/05
Dispositive Motions, <i>Daubert,</i> and <i>Markman</i> Motions		7/1/05

DEADLINE OR EVENT		AGREED DATE
Meeting <i>In Person</i> to Prepare Statement	Joint Final Pretrial	8/29/05
Joint Final Pretrial Statement		9/16/05
All Other Motions Including N Briefs	lotions <i>In Limine</i> , Trial	10/3/05
Final Pretrial Conference		10/3/05
Trial Term Begins		11/1/05
Estimated Length of Trial		10 Days
Jury / Non-Jury		Non-Jury
Mediation	Deadline: Mediator: Address: Telephone:	8/5/05 TBD
All Parties Consent to Proceed Before Magistrate Judge		Yes:
		No: <u>X</u>
		Likely to Agree:

I. Meeting of Parties.

Pursuant to Local Rule 3.05(c)(2)(B) or (c)(3)(A), a meeting was held on January 15, 2004, at 1:30 p.m., and was attended in person by:

Name <u>Counsel For</u>

Ann Frank Plaintiffs

Mark Steinbeck United States of America

Counsel for Plaintiffs subsequently met with Kenneth M. Oliver, counsel for the State of Florida, who concurred with the scheduling matters reflected herein.

II. Pre-Discovery Initial Disclosures of Core Information.

A. Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1)(C) - (D) Disclosures.

The parties agree to exchange information described in Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1)(C) - (D) by February 27, 2004.

Below is a description of information disclosed or scheduled for disclosure.

Plaintiff's statement of damages.

B. Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1)(A) - (B) Disclosures.

The parties agree to exchange information referenced by Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1)(A) - (B) by February 27, 2004.

Below is a description of information disclosed or scheduled for disclosure.

Information required by Rule 26(a)(1)(A) & (B).

III. Agreed Discovery Plan for Plaintiffs and Defendants.

A. Certificate of Interested Persons and Corporate Disclosure Statement.

This Court has previously ordered each party, governmental party, intervenor, non-party movant, and Rule 69 garnishee to file and serve a Certificate of Interested Persons and Corporate Disclosure Statement using a mandatory form. No party may seek discovery from any source before filing and serving a

Certificate of Interested Persons and Corporate Disclosure Statement. A motion, memorandum, response, or other paper — including emergency motion — is subject to being denied or stricken unless the filing party has previously filed and served its Certificate of Interested Persons and Corporate Disclosure Statement. Any party who has not already filed and served the required certificate is required to do so immediately.

Every party that has appeared in this action to date has filed and served a Certificate of Interested Persons and Corporate Disclosure Statement, which remains current:

Yes: X	
No:	
Amended Certificate will be filed by(date).	(party) on or before

B. Discovery Not Filed.

The parties will not file discovery materials with the Clerk except as provided in Local Rule 3.03. The Court encourages the exchange of discovery requests on diskette. See Local Rule 3.03 (f). The parties further agree as follows: NA.

C. Limits on Discovery.

Absent leave of Court, the parties may take no more than ten depositions per side (not per party). Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(a)(2)(A); Fed.R.Civ.P. 31(a)(2)(A); Local Rule 3.02(b). Absent leave of Court, the parties may serve no more than twenty-five interrogatories, including sub-parts. Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(a); Local Rule 3.03(a). The parties may agree by stipulation on other limits on discovery. The Court will consider the parties' agreed dates, deadlines, and other limits in entering the scheduling order. Fed.R.Civ.P. 29. In addition to the deadlines in the above table, the parties have agreed to further limit discovery as follows:

- Depositions. The parties request leave of Court to take no more than 15 depositions per side based on the nature of the claims in this matter creating the probability that each side will have 4 or more experts and on the number of individual parties and medical providers.
- 2. Interrogatories. The parties request leave of Court to propound

no more than 50 interrogatories per side based on the nature of the claims in this matter creating the probability that each side will have 4 or more experts and on the number of individual parties and medical providers.

- 3. Document Requests. NA.
- 4. Requests to Admit. NA.
- 5. Supplementation of Discovery. NA.

D. Discovery Deadline.

Each party shall timely serve discovery requests so that the rules allow for a response prior to the discovery deadline. The Court may deny as untimely all motions to compel filed after the discovery deadline. In addition, the parties agree as follows: to split discovery deadlines to allow expert opinion discovery to be conducted after conclusion of fact discovery, in an effort to make unnecessary the taking of supplemental depositions of expert witnesses.

E. Disclosure of Expert Testimony.

On or before the dates set forth in the above table for the disclosure of expert reports, the parties agree to fully comply with Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(2) and 26(e). Expert testimony on direct examination at trial will be limited to the opinions, basis, reasons, data, and other information disclosed in the written expert report disclosed pursuant to this order. Failure to disclose such information may result in the exclusion of all or part of the testimony of the expert witness. The parties agree on the following additional matters pertaining to the disclosure of expert testimony: NA.

F. Confidentiality Agreements.

Whether documents filed in a case may be filed under seal is a separate issue from whether the parties may agree that produced documents are confidential. The Court is a public forum, and disfavors motions to file under seal. The Court will permit the parties to file documents under seal only upon a finding of extraordinary circumstances and particularized need. See Brown v. Advantage Engineering, Inc., 960 F.2d 1013 (11th Cir. 1992); Wilson v. American Motors Corp., 759 F.2d 1568 (11th Cir. 1985). A party seeking to file a document under seal must file a motion to file under seal requesting such Court action, together with a memorandum of law in

Α.

support. The motion, whether granted or denied, will remain in the public record.

The parties may reach their own agreement regarding the designation of materials as "confidential." There is no need for the Court to endorse the confidentiality agreement. The Court discourages unnecessary stipulated motions for a protective order. The Court will enforce appropriate stipulated and signed confidentiality agreements. See Local Rule 4.15. Each confidentiality agreement or order shall provide, or shall be deemed to provide, that "no party shall file a document under seal without first having obtained an order granting leave to file under seal on a showing of particularized need." With respect to confidentiality agreements, the parties agree as follows: NA.

G. Other Matters Regarding Discovery. NA.

IV. Settlement and Alternative Dispute Resolution.

Settlement.

The parties agree that settlement prior to completion of discovery is: _____likely __X __ unlikely. The parties request a settlement conference before a U.S. Magistrate Judge. _____yes __X __no ____likely to request in future B. Arbitration. Local Rule 8.02(a) defines those civil cases that will be referred to arbitration automatically. Does this case fall within the scope of Local Rule 8.02(a)? _____yes __X __no For cases not falling within the scope of Local Rule 8.02(a), the parties consent to arbitration pursuant to Local Rules 8.02(a)(3) and 8.05(b): _____yes __X __no _____likely to agree in future ______Binding ______Non-Binding

In any civil case subject to arbitration, the Court may substitute mediation for arbitration upon a determination that the case is susceptible to resolution through mediation. Local Rule 8.02(b). The parties agree that this case is susceptible to

	resolu arbitra	•	ediation, and th	erefore	jointly request mediation in place of
		X_ yes	no	like	ly to agree in future
	C.	Mediation.			
	appro	_			d to use a mediator from the Court's stated in the table above as the last
	D.	Other Alterna	itive Dispute R	esoluti	on. NA
Date:					I. Perez d States Attorney
				Ву:	Mark A. Steinbeck Assistant United States Attorney Florida Bar No. 913431 2110 First Street, Suite 3-137 Fort Myers, Florida 33901 Telephone: (239) 461-2200 Facsimile: (239) 461-2219 Counsel for the United States
Date:				Florid Ann - 2124 Naple Telep Facs	T. Frank da Bar No. 0888370 G. Frank, P.A. Airport Road South, Suite 102 es, Florida 34112 chone: (239) 793-5353 dmile: (239) 793-6888 dissel for Plaintiffs
Date:				 Kenr	neth M. Oliver

Assistant Attorney General Office of the Florida Attorney General 2000 Main Street, Suite 400 Fort Myers, Florida 33901 Telephone: (239) 664-8403

Facsimile: (239) 939-0070 Counsel for the State of Florida